

REMARKS

Based upon the Notice of "Amendments in a Revised Format Now Permitted" published by the USPTO on January 31, 2003 waiving the provisions of 37 CFR § 1.121(a), (b), (c) and (d), the present Amendment is submitted as being compliance therewith.

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed March 19, 2003. Claims 29-38 are pending. No fee is believed to be necessary for entry of this Response. However, authorization is granted to charge our deposit account no. 18-1644 for any fees, if necessary, for entry of this Response.

Claims 29-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takizawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,425) in view of Lightbody et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,471,577). With respect to claims 29-38, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants' invention of independent claim 29 is directed to an image pickup apparatus for forming a digital image signal in which a color converting part is arranged to convert color of the digital image signal in response to an external color control signal from an external apparatus. The apparatus includes a device recognition attribute information memory for storing device recognition attribute information. An interface part is arranged to communicate with the external apparatus, wherein the interface part sends the device recognition attribute information to the external apparatus, then the interface part receives the external color control signal with which the color of the digital image signal is controlled according to a result of recognition by the external apparatus.

Independent claim 33 is directed to an image pickup method corresponding to the image pickup apparatus of independent claim 29. Independent claim 35 is directed to an image signal

processing apparatus connectable to the image pickup apparatus of independent claim 29, and independent claim 37 is directed to an image signal processing method corresponding to the apparatus of independent claim 35. These constructions are not taught or suggested by the cited art of record.

The Examiner states with respect to each of claims 29, 33, 35 and 37 that the Takizawa et al. patent discloses:

“an image pickup device for forming a digital image signal (Takizawa: column 4, lines 10-15); a device recognition attribute information memory for storing device recognition attribute information (Takizawa: column 3, lines 9-12); an interface part arranged to communicate with the external apparatus (Takizawa: column 4, lines 57-60), wherein said interface part sends said device recognition attribute information to said external apparatus (Takizawa: column 3, lines 60-64), then said interface part receives said external control signal with which the digital image signal is controlled (Takizawa: column 3, lines 64-65) according to the result of recognition by said external apparatus (Takizawa: column 3, lines 51-62)”

The Takizawa et al. patent is directed to an electronic still camera in which an image is detected to generate an image signal which is then processed and converted into a digital image signal. According to the portions of Takizawa et al. cited by the Examiner, the digital image signal is temporarily stored in a buffer memory (26) and then passed through a digital signal processor (DSP 27) where it is compressed and thereafter stored in a storage medium (28). The significant feature of the camera of the Takizawa et al. patent is that the program for the DSP is stored in a rewritable DSP program memory (27a). A communication circuit (35) permits modifying or upgrading the DSP program by reading DSP program data from an external source (36) to be written into the DSP program memory (27a).

The Takizawa, et al. patent thus teaches an electronic still camera wherein the DSP

program data can be written into the DSP program memory from an external source. The patent does not teach or suggest that the camera includes a device recognition memory for storing device recognition attribute information, and further does not teach or suggest an interface part arranged to communicate with an external apparatus, wherein the interface part sends the device recognition attribute information to the external apparatus.

The patent also does not teach that such interface part subsequently receives an external color control signal with which the color of a digital image signal is controlled according to a result of recognition by the external apparatus. In fact, the portion of the reference specifically cited by the Examiner for this feature describes a microcomputer program memory 29a that contains a control program that controls processing other than the image processing carried out by the DSP. (Col. 3, lines 51-62).

Clearly, none of the passages in the Takizawa et al. patent cited by the Examiner provides any basis for the Examiner's assertion that the Takizawa et al. patent discloses device recognition attribute information memory for storing device recognition attribute information, or an interface part for sending device recognition attribute information to an external apparatus and then receiving an external control signal for controlling the digital image signal according to the results of device recognition by the external apparatus. The Examiner's reliance on the Takizawa, et al. patent is therefore misplaced.

The Lightbody et al. patent, which was cited for the disclosure of a plurality of color space converting means, adds nothing to the Takizawa et al. patent to change this conclusion. Regardless of the disclosure of a color space converter (80), the Lightbody et al. reference is silent as to device recognition attribute information. Thus, applicants' claims 29-38 patentably

distinguish over the Takizawa et al. patent even in view of the Lightbody et al. patent.

In view of the above, neither of the references cited by the examiner, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest a camera having the image pickup apparatus and method as claimed in applicants' independent claims 29, 33, 35 and 37. Claims 30-32, 34, 36 and 38, which depend from claims 29, 33, 35 and 37, respectively, are also submitted as patentable for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to the independent claims because they differ in scope from such claims.


Therefore, claims 29-38 are all submitted as being patentable based upon the cited references failing to disclose or suggest the content of the claims within the meaning of Section 103. In view of the above, it is submitted that applicants' claims patentably distinguish over the cited art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that an interview would expedite consideration of the application, a request is made that the Examiner telephone applicants' counsel at (212) 682-9640.

Dated: June 17, 2003

ROBIN BLECKER & DALEY
330 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10017
T (212) 682-9640

Respectfully submitted,


John J. Torrente
Reg. No. 26,359
Attorney of Record